DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 463 **HE 012 490**

AUTHOR	Gruson, Edward S.
TITLE	International Education (Working Paper).
SPONS AGENCY	Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education, Cambridge, Mass.
PUB DATE	Oct 78
NOTE	58p.; For related Sloan Commission documents see HE 012 421-427, HE 012 429-432, HE 012 434-439, HE 012 442-445, HE 012 448-449, HE 012 465-474, HE 012 476-480, HE 012 482-490.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Area Studies; Educational Finance; *Federal Programs; Fellowships; Financial Support; Foreign Students; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *International Education; International Studies; Research Projects; *Second Language Programs; *Student Exchange Programs; Study Abroad
IDENTIFIERS	*National Defense Education Act Title VI; *Sloan Commission Studies

ABSTRACT

The history, objectives, and funding patterns for international education are discussed. Attention is directed toward the language and area study centers of the U.S. Office of Education, undergraduate/graduate and scholarly exchange programs, and the support of advanced research in international studies. The main source of funds for language and area centers has been the institution, followed by the NDEA program, and the Ford Foundation, respectively. Recent estimates indicate that NDEA Title VI funds continue to represent about 10-11 percent of the total costs of operations at all centers. Information on the number of centers by world regions in 1969 and 1977 indicates a decline in each region, and most dramatically for South Asian, Southeast Asian, and East Asian Studies. Additionally, a decline in graduate fellowship awards under NDEA Title VI has occurred. Enrollment trends in modern foreign languages since 1969 and number of degrees in NDEA center programs by area of study are presented. Since funds from NDEA Title VI may not, by law, be used for the support of research in international affairs, the support is provided from university sources, foundations, or other federal programs. Data is presented on distribution of foreign students by the United States by subregion of origin, foreign students from OPEC nations, distribution of students by type of institution, academic level, major region in the United States, states, and fields of study. Data on Fulbright programs supporting U.S. citizens to study abroad is included. Policy issues are also discussed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184463

Sloan Commission on Government
and Higher Education

(Working Paper)

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

by

Edward S. Gruson

October 1978

HE 012 490

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	ii
Acknowledgement	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE CORE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION	7
1. Foreign Language and Area Study Centers	7
2. Foreign Language and Area Study Fellowships	14
3. Advanced Research in International Affairs	19
4. The Exchange of Foreign and American Undergraduates, Graduate Students, and Scholars	35
III. RECENT EVENTS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION	41
IV. SOME QUESTIONS AND POLICY ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED	43
Appendix: Departments, Agencies and Programs Involved in International Education According to the ACE	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	APPROPRIATIONS NDEA - Title VI, 1970-79	10
2	FOREIGN STUDIES AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT OFFICE OF EDUCATION	11
3	DISTRIBUTION OF NDEA CENTERS BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION 1970-71 AND 1977-78	12
4	NUMBER OF NDEA-TITLE VI CENTERS BY WORLD AREA 1969 AND 1977	13
5	SUMMARY OF CHANGE IN ANNUAL LEVEL OF SUPPORT OF 33 MAJOR NDEA-TITLE VI CENTERS, 1965-72 AND 1975-76	14
6	FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES FELLOWSHIPS	15
7	ENROLLMENTS IN MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES	16
8	DEGREES RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS IN NDEA CENTER PROGRAM--MINIMUM OF 15 CREDIT HOURS IN LANGUAGE AND AREA TRAINING ACADEMIC YEARS 1959-76	17
9	TOTAL HIGHER EDUCATION AND FOREIGN ENROLLMENT IN THE U.S.	22
10	TEN MAJOR COUNTRIES WITH THE GREATEST PROPORTION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS IN RELATION TO TOTAL HIGHER EDUCATION ENROLLMENT	23
11	TEN MAJOR HOST COUNTRIES OF FOREIGN STUDENTS	24
12	FOREIGN STUDENTS 1954-55 TO 1976-77	24
13	DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS BY SUBREGION	25
14	LEADING COUNTRIES WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE U.S.	26
15	FOREIGN STUDENTS FROM ORGANIZATION OF PETROLEUM EXPORTING COUNTRIES (OPEC)	27
16	DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION (1976-77)	28
17	DISTRIBUTION BY ACADEMIC LEVELS	29
18	DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS (1976-77)	29
19	DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS BY MAJOR REGION IN U.S.	30

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
20	STATES WITH MOST FOREIGN STUDENTS	31
21	INSTITUTIONS WITH MOST FOREIGN STUDENTS (1976-77)	32
22	DISTRIBUTION BY FIELDS OF STUDY	34
23	DISTRIBUTION BY FIELD AND LEVEL 1975-76	35
24	FULBRIGHT PROGRAMS SUPPORTING GRADUATE STUDENT GRANTS TO U.S. CITIZENS TO STUDY ABROAD	38
25	FULBRIGHT PROGRAMS SUPPORTING FACULTY GRANTS TO U.S. CITIZENS TO STUDY ABROAD	39
26	EXCHANGE BY AREA ACADEMIC GRANTS TO U.S. CITIZENS TO STUDY ABROAD	40
27	EXCHANGE BY AREA FOREIGN GRANTEES TO THE U.S.	40

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A number of people in New York, Washington and Cambridge gave me unstintingly of their time, data and insights. I am grateful to them all. David Levine and Larry Lustberg of the Commission staff were enormously helpful by their assistance and criticism.

ESG

I. INTRODUCTION

International education is a messy amalgam of quite disparate functions, objectives and programs set in labyrinthine political, financial, institutional and administrative environments. To its devotees and practitioners it is a noble, altruistic quest for mutual understanding and respect among peoples, cultures and nations in an increasingly "interdependent" world.

Yet there is disagreement among enthusiasts about just what name to use as an umbrella-term. For some, international education alludes to a specific set of educational and research activities in international studies in selected colleges and universities. Others prefer the phrase "global perspectives" which "is intended to convey that the entire gamut of purposes and programs of higher education institutions in the United States today -- and throughout the globe -- should be defined and function in the context of an increasingly interrelated and interdependent world." (Emphasis added). Many limit the use of the phrase "global education" to those programs which attempt to internationalize the elementary and secondary school curriculum.

Under the rubric of international education are squeezed:

1) Foreign Language and Area Studies Centers
2) Advanced Research in International Studies
3) International Exchange of Students and Faculty
4) College and University Participation in Technical Assistance Programs
5) Programs designed to create a citizenry more enlightened and intelligent regarding other cultures, people and nations. Included here are programs intended to:

a) Internationalize the undergraduate and graduate curricula.

b) Provide "outreach" from area and language centers to the non-academic or student communities through private voluntary organizations or other arrangements.

Within the executive branch of the federal government there are 105 programs thought by the American Council on Education to be concerned with international education. These are spread among a minimum of 32 agencies and involve the expenditure of about $3 billion per year (see Appendix 1): a group of extremely varied programs administered by a large number of agencies and departments, responsible to many different authorizing and appropriating committees and sub-committees of both the House and the Senate.

Compounding the problems created by the diversity of programs and the vagueness of the bonds which hold them together is international education's apparent low status within the offices and bureaus which deal with it. For example, because Area and Language Centers represent such a small proportion of the budget of the U.S. Office of Education (0.002%) it is especially vulnerable to curtailment during periods of intense fiscal pressure. In the newly formed International Communications Agency it is not clear that the educational and cultural objectives of what was the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs will survive the overwhelming dominance of what was the U.S. Information Agency.

The clients of international education comprise a growing number of institutions of higher education, higher education associations, non-profit agencies engaged in a variety of administrative, educational and promotional efforts, a host of academy-related professional and learned societies whose efforts include, among other things, organizing major or

modest international exchanges among graduate students, scholars and scientists and a broad assortment of private voluntary organizations whose activities range from policy analysis to citizens education in international affairs.

For those advocating global perspectives little or no distinction is made between the effectiveness of improving the opportunities for American students to study abroad, facilitating the opportunity for foreign students to study in the United States or encouraging faculty exchanges as a means of "internationalizing" American higher education. Policymakers are not offered evidence with which to help direct and determine federal policy choices among alternatives. Furthermore, institutions receive little help in ordering their own priorities -- should institutional resources be allocated to remedial programs, improving equal educational programs, diversifying technical and vocational offerings or to increasing efforts in internationalizing the curriculum? Policymakers, federal and institutional, are confronted with reports which are exhortatory rather than analytical and with which it is difficult to take exception. The aims are lofty and laudatory but not readily made operational.

It would probably be "better or nicer" if more American students were familiar with other, especially non-Western, cultures. It would be "better and nicer" if fluency in a second language were more common among American college students. It probably would be helpful if a larger proportion of the American population better understood and appreciated the complexities of other cultures and international relations. But it is difficult to see how federal higher education policy can do a great deal to affect these issues or whether, in the light of other demands, the objectives of "global perspectives" warrant major federal intervention.

It is probable that most of the objectives of those who advocate global perspectives will come about, at least in part but perhaps more slowly than some would like, as colleges and universities review their undergraduate curricula. These decisions may be made by individual faculties, as well as systems administrators, as they mould and reshape the undergraduate curricula of private and public institutions. Individuals, associations and others may try to generate federal incentives but such efforts are not likely to succeed.

While these multitudes of clients are zealous and proud of their support of international education, their efforts have not persuaded Congress to increase appropriations for these programs or even to fund any of the provisions of the International Education Act of 1966. Although the funds available have remained steady or declined in current dollars, the number of individuals or groups seeking to share the funds has grown. The competition for funds has created considerable tension among the aspirants and candidates and is undoubtedly the root of at least some of the political problems.

In the face of fiscal constraints, one sector of the higher education community seeks to increase its share of the available funds at the expense of another sector. Programs designed to be availed of by universities with considerable library resources and experienced faculties of national rank are described pejoratively as "elitist." The Congress is lobbied to change the geographical distribution of awards in favor of one region over another or to reserve a proportion of the funds available for distribution to specific kinds of institutions of higher education. The pressures felt in this arena are not unlike those experienced in the

distribution of funds for basic research, and in the absence of a well-institutionalized screening instrument comparable to peer review, much harder to resist.

For many people involved in international education, especially those concerned with "global perspectives," and for a number of institutions engaged in overseas activities, technical assistance sponsored by the Agency for International Development and others is a major function. Yet it is difficult to define in what way institutions of higher education are uniquely capable of providing such assistance. The professional skills and expert qualifications required to provide technical assistance are fairly broadly distributed and only rarely found exclusively within higher education.

Technical assistance is a service which some institutions are organized to offer, often successfully, in competition with non-academic entities. That such activities contribute to the "internationalization" of an institution is true, at least to some extent. They offer opportunities for faculty and some students to work in international, frequently non-Western settings. Since decisions to participate in technical assistance programs are made, and must be made, by each institution individually and since no federal higher education policies are involved it is treated only very briefly here.

AID funds a very modest amount of developmental research in colleges and universities but is not listed by NSF as a sponsoring agency for basic research. Yet, since agricultural development plays such a large role in AID's efforts, the land-grant colleges and state universities have been very active in this program. This was particularly true in the 1960's as more and more of the developing countries attempted

to replicate the American land-grant model in their national systems of higher education. Later, AID's major strategy of technical assistance involved American colleges and universities in closer linkages with their counterparts in the less developed countries in collaborative efforts of applied research aimed at resolving immediate problems. In the last five years, the role of American colleges and universities in technical assistance declined as AID concentrated its efforts on "the poorest of the poor" countries and emphasized informal training programs. With the adoption in 1975, however, of Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act, the Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Amendment, it is expected that the role of higher education institutions will increase. One of the intentions of Title XII is to strengthen agricultural research at selected American institutions to act as an international resource for the study of world food and nutrition problems.

In the field of international education what may to some appear as a mess and a muddle is for others "a nationwide potpourri of rich variety."

II. THE CORE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

For many sectors of higher education and scholarship, the academic and intellectual heart of international education are the language and area study centers administered by the Division of International Education of the U.S. Office of Education; undergraduate, graduate and scholarly exchange programs; and the support of advanced research in International Studies, the funding of which is scattered through a number of departments and agencies. This paper will concentrate on these programs since from an educational policy view they are the core of international education.

A somewhat more detailed look at the history, objectives and funding patterns of the constituent parts of international education, followed by a more detailed discussion of the interactions of the actors in this arena, illuminates the tenuous nature of this field and the difficult political problems to be overcome in unravelling the tangled relationships and rationalizing the enterprise.

1. FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDY CENTERS

A. Brief History

Title VI of The National Defense Education Act of 1958 authorized Federal support for the improvement of instruction in the sciences, mathematics and foreign languages. The legislation, as far as the study of foreign languages was concerned, emphasized graduate studies and encouraged a broader geographic distribution of institutions capable of training Ph.D.'s in this field. "New Centers of Excellence" became a catch-phrase. In association with Title VI, a National Defense Foreign Language Fellowship Program was established to underwrite the expenses of graduate students.

However, a 1973 study of the consequences of Title VI from its inception through 1970 reported a number of intriguing trends. In language courses, graduate enrollments were in a majority only in African and South Asian studies. In area courses, undergraduates were in the majority of enrollments in all seven regions covered. Reflecting this interest, a number of NDEA - Title VI Foreign Language and Area Studies Centers targeted to the needs of undergraduates were already in place by 1970; today, there are fifteen such centers.

In 1975 as well, regulations were changed by OE to assure that Foreign Langauge and Area Study Centers spent at least 15% of their federal funds on outreach activities. Such activities include:

a) Assistance to other colleges and universities through library, faculty and student exchanges, among other things.

b) Assistance to elementary and secondary education through the provision of advisory services in such areas as curricular development, the development of teaching materials, instructional services, etc.

c) Assistance to the business community through workshops, evening seminars, language courses, etc.

d) Providing on- and off-campus activities for the general public as well as participating in the use of television, radio and newspapers in spreading information of the world region specialized in by the center.

e) Establishing student and faculty exchanges with universities in the region specialized in by the center as well as joint research efforts.

B. Funding History

Support for language and area studies bloomed during the sixties and fell on hard times during the past decade. The foundations, Rockefeller, Carnegie, and especially Ford, in one of their most imaginative, timely, and significant actions, were the only major sources of funds in the period between the late '40's and 1960. In the decade 1960-1970, the Ford Foundation alone awarded over $242 million to international studies compared to a total of $229.1 millions in support of all NDEA - Title VI programs by the Federal government. In the past year however the Ford Foundation's commitment to area studies dropped to a level of $3 and $4 millions, most of which was spent overseas.

The decline in support of these centers and programs by the Ford Foundation coincided with the decline of federal funding. Thus, as in basic research, an era of abundance was replaced in a very short time by an economy of scarcity. The decrease in the support of these activities by the Ford Foundation was especially significant since in order to maintain these centers and programs, colleges and universities had to replace these funds with their own resources at a time when inflation and other soaring costs were causing severe fiscal problems. It is important to note that at no time did NDEA - Title VI funds pay fully for the costs of Language and Area Study Centers. University resources have always been the main support of the Centers. In 1970 an estimated 82% of the total revenue of all of these centers came from internal institutional resources while Title VI funds accounted for 10% and Ford Foundation funds were responsible for 5%. For programs not in the first-quartile on a measure of quality, internal funds were responsible for only 69%

of costs, NDEA - Title VI for 15% and Ford Foundation for 9%. Recent estimates indicate that NDEA - Title VI funds continue to represent about 10-11% of the total costs of operations at all Centers.

Trends in federal funding of NDEA - Title VI are shown in the following table.

TABLE 1

APPROPRIATIONS NDEA - Title VI, 1970-79

Fiscal Year	Authorizations ($000)	Budget Request ($000)	Appropriations ($000)	Constant $s (1960) ($000)
1970	30,000	15,000	13,002	9,801
1971	38,500	4,930	7,170	5,200
1972	38,500	13,740	13,940	9,870
1973	50,000	10,000	12,525	8,330
1974	75,000	0	11,330	6,810
1975	75,000	8,650	11,300	6,220
1976	75,000	10,000	13,300	6,920
1977	75,000	13,000	14,630	7,240
1978	75,000	13,300	15,000	8,980
1979	75,000	15,000		

Clearly it is easier to authorize than to appropriate. The program has been saved by Congress on at least two occasions during the Nixon presidency.

The fundamental rationale for federal support of Foreign Studies and Language Development Centers is national security. The NDEA of 1958 provides funds as a consequence of a Congressional determination of an educational emergency "in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States." In addition to science and mathematics the act specifies the support of training in foreign languages in which adequate

instruction is not available and the support of training in other disciplines needed to understand the region or country in which the language is spoken.

Title VI of the NDEA of 1958 supports the following programs:

a) Language and Area Study Centers within colleges and universities, which centers are interdisciplinary, generally non-departmental and have funding sources other than Title VI.

b) Undergraduate and/or graduate programs in international studies. These are one-time "starter" grants.

c) Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships for graduate students which, except for a few overseas programs, must be used in the United States.

d) Research programs limited to determining the need for increased or improved instruction in foreign language.

A resume of the funding of these programs follows.

TABLE 2

FOREIGN STUDIES AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

NDEA - Title VI Program	FY 1978 (est.) $ Millions	FY 1978 (est.) No. of awards	Cumulative 1959-78 $ Millions
Centers	$ 8.0	80 centers	$ 81.1
International Studies			
Graduate	0.5	13 projects	3.5
Undergraduate	0.9	25 projects	5.2
Fellowships	4.6	828 awards	88.0
Research	1.0	35 awards	47.3
Summer Intensive Language Program (Discontinued)	--	--	4.0
Total	$15.0		$229.1

Between 1959 and 1973, the development of these centers was encouraged and annual refunding was assured once an award was made. At its peak, 106 centers were created. In 1973, as a consequence of drastic budget cuts, the program was reoriented to fund only 50 centers; for these awards all then-funded Centers had to compete with new applicants. By 1975, 66 centers were funded. "Outreach" activities have been added to the criteria for awarding grants. Since 1976, awards to 80 centers have been made for 3-year periods. Of these, 15 have been given to undergraduate centers.

The centers are fewer in number but not more widely distributed among types of institutions. The following table notes the predominance of research university-sponsored centers.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF NDEA CENTERS BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION
1970-71 AND 1977-78

	1970-71		1977-78	
	No. of Centers	No. of Inst.	No. of Centers	No. of Inst.
Research University I	82	24	60	26
Research University II	15	11	14	9
Doctorate-Granting Institution I	6	5	2	2
Comprehensive Colleges and Univs. I	6	5	4	4
Liberal Arts Colleges I	3	3	2	2

In 1970-71, there were 106 NDEA centers; in 1977-78, there were 80. The slight discrepancy between this data and Table 3 can be attributed to the fact that several of these centers are jointly administered by two or more institutions.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF NDEA-TITLE VI CENTERS BY WORLD AREA 1969 AND 1977

World Area	1969	1977
Latin America	14	11
East Europe	18	14
Middle East	13	12
Africa	8	7
South Asia	16	8
Southeast Asia	8	3
East Asia	22	16
Other		9*

* Included are two Canadian Studies Centers, a Center for the Study of World Food Issues, two Centers for International Studies, a Western European Studies Center, a Center for Comparative Studies, a Pacific Island Studies Center and a Center for Mediterranean Studies.

The number of centers for studies in each region has declined; most dramatically for South Asian, Southeast Asian and East Asian Studies. Among the questions raised concerning those institutions which have lost center status are: What has happened to the library holdings of such universities? What has happened to the research capacity and opportunity of the faculty? What has happened to the country's capacity to translate foreign, especially non-Roman alphabet languages?

Another indicator of the decline in support of area studies can be seen by tracking the level of financial support for these centers by world area. A survey of thirty-three centers showed that funding declined for centers in each of the world areas; financial support fell by about one-third measured in current dollars and by almost two-thirds measured in constant dollars.

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF CHANGE IN ANNUAL LEVEL OF SUPPORT OF 33 MAJOR NDEA - TITLE VI CENTERS, 1965-72 AND 1975-76

World Area	Average Annual Support in 1965-1972 Period	Support in 1975-76	Percent Change	1975-1976 Support in Constant (1967) Dollars	Percent Change
1. Latin America	$107,000	$ 42,000	-60.7%	$ 24,000	-77.6%
2. Russia and East Europe	533,000	339,000	-36.4%	190,000	-64.4%
3. Middle East	456,000	253,000	-44.5%	142,000	-68.8%
4. Africa	310,000	158,000	-49.0%	89,000	-71.3%
5. South and/or Southeast Asia	834,000	730,000	-12.5%	409,000	-50.9%
6. East Asia	943,000	608,000	-35.5%	340,000	-63.9%
	$3,183,000	$2,130,000	-33.1%	$1,194,000	-62.5%

These data do not directly address the questions of how many centers should be studying what world regions, of what size, graduating what numbers of persons, with what degrees of competency. A review of the data on enrollments in the less commonly taught languages begs similar questions.

2. FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDY FELLOWSHIPS

Title VI not only provides funds for the support of language and area studies centers but also graduate students at these centers. These fellowships average about $6,000 per year and are renewable. The institution or center receives a "quota" of fellowships for which it nominates recipients. The U.S. Office of Education then awards these fellowships to recipients from those nominated by the institution or center.

The number of awards has declined precipitously and steadily since 1967. In that year 2,557 awards were made compared to only 833 in 1977.

TABLE 6

FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES FELLOWSHIPS

	Graduate Awards				
World Area	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Africa	115	85	75	83	78
Latin America	115	88	54	74	85
Middle East	176	131	144	160	153
East Asia	315	236	202	198	195
South Asia	130	99	95	105	102
Southeast Asia	71	53	63	79	73
U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe	166	124	130	143	144
Western Europe	22	15	0	0	3
Total	1,110	831	763	842	833

Notwithstanding the decline in funding of area study centers and the decline in graduate fellowship awards under NDEA - Title VI, American colleges and universities offer an extraordinary array of opportunities to study foreign languages. A recent Chronicle of Higher Education reports on enrollments in 126 different languages ranging from Akkadian to Zulu. The offerings range from the exotic languages of western and central Africa or central Asia to the more commonly taught Romance languages. Ancient Egyptian and Akkadian are available as well as Modern Greek.

While it is true that total enrollments in modern foreign languages have declined in both postsecondary and secondary institutions, the numbers remain very large. Overwhelmingly, students study one or more of the five commonly taught languages (French, German, Italian, Russian

and Spanish). However, the proportion of students studying the less commonly taught languages is rising. This fact is perhaps more significant than the decline in total enrollments and in enrollments in the five commonly taught languages.

TABLE 7

ENROLLMENTS IN MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

(1) Year	(2) Number	(3) Percent of Total Enrollments	(4) Five Commonly Taught Languages	(5) Less Commonly Taught Languages	(6) 5/2 as Percent
1960	608,749	17.0	595,324	12,099	2.0
1963	801,781	17.8	781,920	19,642	2.5
1965	975,777	17.6	929,215	23,690	2.4
1968	1,073,097	15.5	1,040,284	31,517	3.0
1970	1,067,217	13.5	1,021,465	45,710	4.3
1972	963,930	11.6	904,398	59,425	6.2
1974	897,077	9.9	832,945	64,071	7.1
1977	883,222	N.A.	819,294	63,928	7.2

The essential policy issues relating to foreign languages and area studies are concerned with the adequacy of the supply of specialists in the languages, history, culture, political systems, economics and the interdisciplinary relations among these fields in various regions of the world. In other words, federal policy and financial support are instrumental in meeting national needs, Congress having determined that an educational emergency existed in 1958. But the problem of determining national needs has proven intractable, at least to this time. The problems are manifold. What level of training creates a specialist? How many persons of what level of training in what languages and regions are needed? What is the job market for those people trained in area studies and international studies? How many can be placed in colleges

and universities, government, business and foundations? How to define and keep track of specialists is a problem only now being addressed in a pilot project involving Slavic studies. Until a system is developed to monitor changes in the specialists pool, it is not likely that firm answers to difficult policy questions can be expected. The number of degrees awarded to participants in and graduates of NDEA - Title VI centers provide some clues to the present supply of specialists.

A detailed, comprehensive study of the problems, the products, the supply, the "competences" and the national needs has not been attempted since 1970. That study estimated that NDEA centers would produce between 9,500 and 9,600 doctorates in the decade of the '70's. Apparently these centers graduated just under 7,000 between 1970 and 1976 inclusive. The original estimate has proven very reasonable.

TABLE 8

DEGREES RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS IN NDEA CENTER PROGRAM--MINIMUM OF 15 CREDIT HOURS IN LANGUAGE AND AREA TRAINING ACADEMIC YEARS 1959-76

Area of study	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorates
East Asia	8,674	2,568	914
South Asia	1,638	1,008	569
Southeast Asia	175	404	231
Inner Asia	74	92	43
Asia, general	3,884	2,001	512
South and Southwest Asia	1,480	595	266
Middle East	4,350	1,531	793
Soviet and Eastern Europe	11,848	4,156	1,425
Africa	5,387	2,755	940
Latin America	24,471	7,439	2,688
Pacific	37	79	23
Canada	233	3	12
Comparative Study	148	78	36
General	---	503	43
Asia-East Europe	278	150	28
Northwest Europe and Western Europe	573	228	97
Total	63,240	23,590	8,620

It has been argued that a truly great university, or one wishing to achieve greatness will, perforce, support language and area studies as a matter of course. Efforts have been made to encourage the participation of humanists and professionals in area studies as recommended in the early review and analysis of the program. In addition, it must be emphasized that "specialists" are trained and trained very well in programs other than those located in centers supported by NDEA - Title VI funds. But, the financial problems of language and area study centers have been heightened by the withdrawal of support by the Ford Foundation and subsequently by the erosion of federal funding by inflation. Without hard data upon which to make recommendations and lacking a perceived "crisis" it is difficult to foresee any major changes in the level of funding of NDEA - Title VI programs in the near future.

There are two trends which lend themselves to a more optimistic outlook. One is the entrance of the National Endowment for the Humanities into the international arena. In 1977 the Endowment spent just over $9 million for the support of research and fellowships in international programs and projects. Secondly, the concept of an NDEA Center is changing sufficiently to include the support of groups of scholars whose efforts concentrate and converge on specific issues affecting large portions of the globe. For example, Cornell University, with the assistance of NDEA - Title VI, has established a Center for the Study of World Food Issues.

3. ADVANCED RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Funds from Title VI of the NDEA may not, by law, be used for the support of research in international affairs. The support of such research must be provided, therefore, from university sources, foundations or other programs of the federal government. University funds are always a scarce resource. Foundation support for this field of research has declined from a peak of about $5 million per year between 1965 and 1975 to almost nothing at the present time. Federal support for research in international security affairs, arms control, international relations and policy as well as advanced study of foreign societies has declined as well. It is estimated that in 1967 funds from federal sources, exclusive of AID, for the support of such research in colleges and universities amounted to $23.5 million sponsored by 25 departments and agencies. By 1976 support had declined to about $18.5 million from 19 departments and agencies -- a decline in constant dollars of 53%.

Like basic research in the physical sciences, federal support for advanced research in international studies is provided by many agencies. The amounts available, however, are comparatively trivial. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, between 1962 and 1978, distributed $47.5 million for external research of which $6.2 million went to scholars at colleges and universities. The financial support of research at institutions of higher education by this agency fluctuates widely year by year. For example, $1.3 millions were obligated in 1966, just over $20,000 in 1973 and $0 in 1971 and 1975. Under pressures from the Mansfield Amendment, the Department of Defense has reduced its support for research in international studies and the social sciences

generally from $13.1 millions in 1967 to $3.6 millions in 1977. The budget for external research of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research is $1 million!

It is not an unmixed blessing that federal funds for advanced research in international studies at colleges and universities are so meager. Such studies are frequently circumscribed by the need, real or imagined, for secrecy and constraints on publication. Such restrictions are incompatible with the nature and objectives of unfettered scholarship and are more readily accommodated in private research organizations. However, many projects and studies remain unrestricted and are uniquely suited to be undertaken by academic centers of advanced research in international studies.

The nation's academic centers maintain the largest stock of non-governmental experts in the knowledge of foreign areas, sustain and provide a working environment for the best private talents and nurture the creation of new talent. These centers support the nation's competence in international studies. As the country's international interests and relations become increasingly broad and complex, university centers of advanced research in international studies are needed now more than ever. As one expert has said:

> These centers constitute the apex of the entire pyramid of international education, and without them much of that effort would be wasted. They provide the data, the analysis, the interpretation, the books, the content, concepts and curriculum, and much of the personnel for the nation's international education. Ultimately, they determine its quality.
>
> They are also the locus, outside the government, of the most informed analysis and interpretation of this nation's position and the position of foreign and domestic affairs and an essential source of criticism of accepted truths in a rapidly changing and complex world.
>
> As in most areas of advanced research and analysis, United States research centers lead and service the world. For centuries, foreign societies have borrowed large parts of their perception of reality from the West and, in particular, from the United

States. As other governments suppress critical thought about their own societies, America's centers have become an international, as well as a national, resource. Their threatened closure would be a major loss. Some dedicated individuals would, of course, continue to push the frontiers of knowledge. But many, isolated and deprived of time, materials, and the ready stimulation of fellow specialists, would shift the focus of their efforts. In particular, able new recruits would shun the field. Indeed, that is already happening. As America becomes more interdependent with other countries, it can ill-afford a dimming eyesight and a growing speech impediment in understanding and interpreting other areas of the world.

4. THE EXCHANGE OF FOREIGN AND AMERICAN UNDERGRADUATES, GRADUATE STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS

A. Foreign Students in the United States

The presence of foreign students on American campuses is thought to promote international and intercultural understanding. In addition, it is believed that encouraging future leaders of their countries to study at American institutions of higher education will create and develop a cadre of influential persons who understand and are friendly to American policies in international affairs. The exchange of students, undergraduate and graduate, is among the essential constituents of international education.

The United States ranks first among host countries in the number of foreign students studying in its institutions of higher education. It has been first among host countries for several decades. However, because such a high proportion of American students go on to higher education compared to other countries, the proportion of total enrollment made up by foreign students in the United States is quite low; it has remained relatively constant at just under 2% for almost twenty years.

TABLE 9

TOTAL HIGHER EDUCATION AND FOREIGN ENROLLMENT IN THE U.S.

Year	Total Enrollment	Foreign Enrollment	Percentage Foreign Enrollment
1960/61	3,583,700	53,100	1.5
1969/70	8,066,200	135,000	1.7
1975/76	11,290,700	179,300	1.6
1976/77	11,121,400	203,100	1.8

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.

The rate of increase of foreign students in the U.S. has paralleled the rate at which total enrollments have increased. In 1975, the United States ranked twenty-first among host-countries according to the number of foreign students as a percentage of total enrollment.

TABLE 10

TEN MAJOR COUNTRIES[1] WITH THE GREATEST PROPORTION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS IN RELATION TO TOTAL HIGHER EDUCATION ENROLLMENT

Country	1969	1975
Canada	3.5[2]	16.9[2]
Switzerland	19.1	15.6
France	5.6	12.4
Austria	15.2	10.7
Greece	7.5	9.0
United Kingdom	3.8	7.4
Belgium	6.1	6.1
Federal Republic of Germany	5.8	5.7
New Zealand	4.2	4.0[3]
Ireland	3.0[4]	3.8
USA	(19th place) 1.7	(21st place) 1.6

Source: UNESCO Office of Statistics, Paris.

1. Developed countries only, i.e. among countries in Europe, North America and Japan, Australia, and New Zealand.
2. Full-time students only.
3. 1974 figures.
4. Estimated.

TABLE 11

TEN MAJOR HOST COUNTRIES[1] OF FOREIGN STUDENTS

1975 Position	Country	Thousands 1969	1975
1	United States of America	135.0	179.3
2	France	34.9	119.5[2]
3	Canada	19.9	98.4
4	United Kingdom	22.8	49.0
5	Federal Republic of Germany	26.7	47.3
6	USSR	--	30.6[3]
7	Italy	12.3	18.9
8	Japan	10.1	14.5
9	Austria	8.5	10.3
10	Switzerland	9.1	10.1

Source: UNESCO Office of Statistics, Paris.

1. Developed countries only, i.e. among countries in Europe, North America and Japan, Australia, and New Zealand.
2. 1974 figures.
3. 1973 figures.

The number of foreign students in the United States increased eight-fold between 1954-55 and 1976-77; from 24,200 to 203,100.

TABLE 12

FOREIGN STUDENTS 1954-55 TO 1976-77[1]

Year	No. of Students	Institutions Reporting
1954-55	24,232	1,629
1964-65	82,045	1,859
1970-71	117,976	1,748
1973-74	125,116	1,359
1974-75[2]	154,580	1,908
1975-76	179,344	2,261
1976-77	203,068	2,524

1. These data are the best available but none too reliable. The trend is clear; the numbers are probably low by 10-25%.
2. In 1974-75 a simple postcard method of obtaining the basic count was adopted by the Institute for International Education and immigrants were excluded. Refugees are included.

Where do they come from?

Students come to the United States to study from all over the world. Table 13 below shows the number of students by sub-region of their continents of origin and Table 14 lists the leading foreign countries with students in the United States.

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS BY SUBREGION

	1975/76		1976/77	
	No.	%	No.	%
East Africa	4,830	2.7	4,500	2.2
Middle Africa	680	0.4	770	0.4
Northern Africa	3,460	1.9	4,330	2.1
Southern Africa	680	0.4	830	0.4
Western Africa	15,620	8.7	15,410	7.6
Africa Total	25,290	14.1	25,860	12.7
East Asia	33,860	18.9	34,400	16.9
Middle South Asia	14,110	7.9	13,800	6.8
South East Asia	16,570	9.2	21,820	10.7
South West Asia	32,590	18.2	38,490	19.0
Asia Total	97,130	54.2	108,510	53.4
Eastern Europe	990	0.6	1,400	0.7
Western Europe	13,410	7.5	15,300	7.5
Europe Total	14,400	8.1	16,700	8.2
Caribbean	6,160	3.4	9,770	4.8
Central America	8,750	4.9	10,780	5.3
South America	14,920	8.3	16,690	8.2
Latin America Total	29,820	16.6	37,240	18.4
North America Total	9,720	5.4	11,420	5.6
Oceania	2,740	1.5	3,150	1.6
Stateless	240	0.1	170	0.1
GRAND TOTAL	179,340	100.0	203,070	100.0

TABLE 14

LEADING COUNTRIES WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE U.S.

Country	Rank			Number of Students		
	1971-72	1975-76	1976-77	1971-72	1975-76	1976-77
Iran	5	1	1	6,365	19,900	23,310
China, Rep. of	4	4	2	7,322	11,330	12,100
Nigeria	8	3	3	2,894	11,440	11,870
Canada	3	6	4	8,916	9,540	11,120
Hong Kong	2	2	5	8,806	11,930	10,970
India	1	5	6	9,582	9,630	9,410
Vietman, Rep. of	22	12	7	1,272	3,160	7,890
Japan	7	8	8	3,977	7,070	7,160
Mexico	13	10	9	1,905	4,620	6,450
Thailand	6	7	10	5,428	7,400	6,070
Venezuela	14	9	11	1,703	4,680	5,750
Saudi Arabia	27	13	12	821	3,030	4,590
Korea, Rep. of	9	11	13	2,758	3,260	3,630
U.K.	10	14	14	2,436	2,760	3,580
Malaysia	28	19	15	812	1,930	2,870
Pakistan	12	12	16	2,095	3,160	2,810
Brazil	19	17	17	1,359	2,160	2,470
Colombia	16	16	18	1,611	2,340	2,450
Lebanon	25	22	19	1,141	1,840	2,220
Israel	15	15	20	1,678	2,430	2,140

* Note: The figures for Cuba have been excluded from this table.

South and East Asia send the largest proportion of foreign students to this country and have done so rather consistently over the past twenty years. The proportion from Africa has risen, mainly as a result of a remarkable increase in the number of students from Nigeria. The proportions from Europe and Latin America have fallen from the levels of the 1960's but have remained stable over the past few years. In all cases the numbers of students have increased.

When the countries of origin of the foreign students in the United States are ranked by enrollment, some shifts become evident. Iran contri-

butes the most students to the United States, changing its relative position from fifth to first between 1971-72 and 1975-76. Nigeria has risen in the ranking from eighth to third while India has fallen from first to sixth (India is the only country among the twenty listed from which fewer students came to the United States in 1976-77 than in 1971-72). As a consequence of the influx of refugees, what had been the Republic of Vietnam now ranks seventh in exporters of students to American institutions. Vietnam is one of four countries (the others are Saudi Arabia, Malaysia and Lebanon) which were not among the twenty leading countries of origin of foreign students in the United States in 1971-72 but which are now.

Students from the OPEC nations comprised 12.4% of the foreign students in the United States in 1971-72. This proportion increased to 25.6% in 1976-77.

TABLE 15

FOREIGN STUDENTS FROM
ORGANIZATION OF PETROLEUM EXPORTING COUNTRIES
(OPEC)

	1971-72	1975-76	1976-77
Algeria	47	430	770
Ecuador	468	690	710
Gabon	2	---	---
Indonesia	583	1,230	1,090
Iran	6,365	19,900	23,310
Iraq	268	450	720
Kuwait	406	1,190	1,240
Libya	494	1,540	1,610
Nigeria	2,894	11,440	11,870
Qatar	36	130	200
Saudi Arabia	821	3,030	4,590
U.A.E.	5	100	180
Venezuela	1,703	4,680	5,750
OPEC Total	14,090	44,810	52,040
World Total	114,024	179,344	203,068
OPEC as a % of World Total	12.4%	25.0%	25.6%

Where do they go?

It is of some interest to know in which sector of American higher education foreign students enroll. Table 16, below, shows the distribution of foreign students by control and level of institution.

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION (1976-77)

	Foreign Students		All Students
	No.	%	%
Control			
Public Institutions	130,387	64.2	78.3
Private Institutions	72,681	35.8	21.7
Level			
Junior Colleges	31,671	15.6	35.2
Other Colleges	171,397	84.4	64.8

A greater proportion of foreign students compared to Americans attend private colleges and universities while a lesser proportion attend two-year institutions. Perhaps private institutions are more attractive, in some cases for religious reasons; also, private institutions may be making greater efforts to attract foreign students. There are also some indications that the two-year institutions are growing in attraction to foreign students.

The proportion of undergraduates to graduate students has changed only slightly during the past twenty years. However, there is some thought that as undergraduate institutions mature overseas, these students will make up a decreasing proportion of foreign student enrollments in the United States.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION BY ACADEMIC LEVEL

	1955-56		1965-67		1976-77	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Undergraduate	20,688	57.9	38,775	47.4	107,720	53.0
Graduate	15,033	42.1	42,945	52.6	95,350	47.0

TABLE 18

DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS (1976-77)

	No. of Foreign Students	% Foreign Students in Class	% All Students in Class	Foreign Students as % of All Students in Class
Research University - I	46,951	23.8	10.2	4.1
Research University - II	46,804	23.7	7.2	5.8
Doctorate-Granting Univ. - I	20,761	10.5	7.2	2.6
Doctorate-Granting Univ. - II	6,486	3.3	2.7	2.1
Comprehensive Univ. & Coll. - I	41,265	20.1	23.5	1.5
Comprehensive Univ. & Coll. - II	7,844	4.0	4.9	1.4
Liberal Arts Colleges - I	3,035	1.5	1.4	2.0
Liberal Arts Colleges - II	8,905	4.5	3.4	2.4
Community and Junior Colleges	15,568	7.9	35.6	0.4

The sample used to develop this table represents about 90% of all foreign students in the United States. Since almost 50% of all foreign students were graduate students, it is not too surprising that almost two-thirds of the foreign students sampled attended the Research Universities or Doctorate-Granting Universities.

Almost one-quarter of the foreign students attend Comprehensive Universities and Colleges at which liberal arts as well as professional and vocational studies are offered. A fairly large number of foreign students attend Liberal Arts Colleges - II. This is probably a

consequence of the large proportion of church-related colleges in this category. Attendance at Junior and Community Colleges is relatively small. Some observers suggest that attendance at these institutions will increase as their capability to teach English as a second language becomes more widely known, as their administrative and counselling capacity improves and as their offerings become more widely disseminated and found attractive.

The data for graduate students are not available by control of institution (private or public) or by distribution within the United States. However the following table shows the distribution of all foreign students through the major regions of the United States.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS BY MAJOR REGION IN U.S.

Region	1968-69		1976-77	
	No.	%	No.	%
Northeast	28,967	23.8	41,187	20.3
South	19,879	16.4	42,460	20.9
Southwest	7,752	6.4	25,749	12.7
Midwest	33,002	27.2	44,959	22.1
Mountain	4,278	3.5	7,697	3.8
Pacific	26,072	21.5	39,707	19.6
Guam, etc.	1,412	1.2	1,309	0.6
Total	121,362	100.0	203,068	100.0

It is clear from the table that about 80% of the foreign students are distributed rather evenly among four major regions: the Northeast, South, Midwest and Pacific. The proportion studying in the Midwest and the Northeast appears to be decreasing while the South and Southwest increase their relative shares.

Among states, California and New York have traditionally had the greatest number of foreign students enrolled. In recent years the enrollment of foreign students in Texas has increased dramatically.

TABLE 20

STATES WITH MOST FOREIGN STUDENTS*

State	1965/65		1970/71		1975/76		1976/77	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
California	13,113	16.0	24,443	16.9	25,929	14.5	30,392	15.0
New York	11,159	13.6	17,294	12.0	18,816	10.5	18,055	8.9
Texas	2,704	3.3	5,887	4.1	12,072	6.7	16,140	8.0
Illinois	4,425	5.4	8,607	5.9	9,404	5.2	8,866	4.4
Massachusetts	4,116	5.0	6,226	4.3	8,352	4.7	8,606	4.2
Florida	1,161	1.4	8,886	6.1	8,148	4.5	8,404	4.1
Michigan	5,014	6.1	7,579	5.2	7,669	4.3	7,997	3.9
District of Columbia	3,067	3.7	4,469	3.1	6,762	3.8	7,792	3.8
Pennsylvania	3,538	4.3	5,350	3.7	5,782	3.2	6,541	3.2
Oklahoma	1,332	1.6	1,894	1.3	4,988	2.8	5,919	2.9
Ohio	2,255	2.7	4,371	3.0	4,520	2.5	5,783	2.9

* In order of magnitude for the academic year 1976/77.

Table 21 shows the twenty American colleges and universities with the largest foreign enrollments in 1976-77.

TABLE 21

INSTITUTIONS WITH MOST FOREIGN STUDENTS (1976-77)*

Rank	Institution	Foreign Students	Total Enrollment	% Foreign
1	Miami Dade (1)	3,808	38,005	10.0
2	Southern California (2)	2,750	28,090	9.8
3	Houston, main campus (7)	2,380	34,277	6.9
4	Wisconsin, Madison (4)	2,267	37,914	6.0
5	Michigan, Ann Arbor (3)	2,048	36,863	5.6
6	Howard (5)	1,948	9,815	19.8
7	Texas, Austin (6)	1,843	41,387	4.5
8	George Washington (20)	1,836	19,567	9.4
9	Harvard (11)	1,745	20,262	8.6
10	New York University (9)	1,691	29,340	5.7
11	Minnesota, Minneapolis (16)	1,600	63,885	2.5
12	California, Berkeley (8)	1,572	35,488	4.4
13	California, Los Angeles (17)	1,519	49,223	3.1
14	Louisiana, Baton Rouge (23)	1,513	25,263	6.0
15	MIT (12)	1,488	8,596	17.3
16	Stanford (18)	1,423	13,043	10.9
17	Washington (25)	1,405	35,277	4.0
18	Indiana, Bloomington (14)	1,388	32,921	4.2
19	American (29)	1,360	12,663	10.7
20	Kansas, main campus (28)	1,281	22,947	5.6
24	Columbia, main division (13)	1,228	15,830	7.8
27	Illinois, Urbana (16)	1,119	34,996	3.2
30	SUNY, Buffalo, main campus (19)	1,127	21,955	5.1
32	San Francisco (15)	1,100	6,239	17.6

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C.

* Ranked by number of foreign students enrolled.
Figures in parenthesis after name of institution is the rank in 1975-76.

Miami-Dade Community College and the University of Southern California enroll the largest number of these students. Houston and George Washington Universities rose most markedly in rank; from seventh and twentieth to third and eighth. Louisiana-Baton Rouge, Washington, American and Kansas, main campus entered the ranks of the twenty institutions with most foreign students while Columbia, Illinois-Urbana, SUNY-Buffalo and San Francisco dropped from the list.

Foreign students may be dispersing among a greater number of campuses since the proportion enrolled in the top 5, 10 and 20 institutions is declining by quite small amounts.

What do they study?

Over the past twenty years engineering continues to be the most popular field, consistently enrolling between 20 and 25% of all foreign students. Business and Management is now the second most popular field of study with slightly over 17% of all foreign student enrollments. Curiously, Agriculture has not been, nor is it now a major field of study. The most dramatic increases in enrollments both absolutely and proportionately have been in Mathematics and Computer Sciences and Education. See Table 22, page 34.

Of some interest is the distribution of fields of study by graduate and undergraduate enrollments. See Table 23, page 35.

In the Fine and Applied Arts and Other categories (predominantly interdisciplinary fields), undergraduate enrollment is more than 70% of the total in these fields. Between 50 and 70% of the enrollment is undergraduate in the fields of Humanities, Business Management, Engineering and Health Sciences. For the other categories, graduate enrollments are in the majority.

TABLE 22

DISTRIBUTION BY FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field	1955/56		1965/66		1975/76		1976/77	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Humanities	4,254	11.9	9,499	11.6	15,030	8.4	14,370	7.1
Education	1,700	4.7	4,248	5.2	9,790	5.5	12,030	5.9
Fine & Applied Arts	2,044	5.7	3,451	4.2	8,320	4.6	8,930	4.4
Social Sciences	4,571	12.8	11,046	13.5	20,730	11.6	20,890	10.3
Business & Management	3,233	9.0	7,909	9.7	28,670	16.0	34,810	17.2
Natural & Life Sciences	4,043	11.3	11,908	14.6	23,910	13.3	22,980	11.3
Mathematics & Computer Science	453	1.3	2,652	3.2	9,060	5.1	9,610	4.7
Engineering	8,089	22.6	18,095	22.3	42,000	23.4	48,990	24.1
Health Professions	3,311	9.3	4,150	5.1	7,180	4.0	11,840	5.8
Agriculture	1,354	3.8	3,064	3.7	5,270	2.9	6,490	3.2
Other	2,730	7.6	5,639	6.9	9,380	5.2	12,130	6.0
		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0

TABLE 23

DISTRIBUTION BY FIELD AND LEVEL 1975-76

	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	No.	%	No.	%
Humanities	8,720	9.1	6,310	7.6
Education	4,050	4.2	5,740	6.9
Fine and Applied Arts	5,920	6.2	2,400	2.9
Social Sciences	7,650	8.0	13,080	15.7
Business and Management	18,460	19.2	10,210	12.2
Natural and Life Sciences	10,330	10.8	13,580	16.3
Mathematics and Computer Sciences	3,690	3.9	5,370	6.4
Engineering	23,770	24.8	18.230	21.8
Health Professions	4,260	4.4	2,920	3.5
Agriculture	2,030	2.1	3,240	3.9
Other	7,030	7.3	2,350	2.8
Total	95,910	100.0	83,430	100.0

B. American Undergraduate Students Abroad and the Exchange of Graduate Students and Scholars

Just as there has been a steady increase in the number of foreign students coming to the United States, the number of American students, undergraduate and graduate, studying abroad has increased dramatically. A complex set of arrangements among various agencies and departments of the federal government, a host of American as well as foreign foundations, a number of professional and learned societies and university sponsored programs encourage undergraduate and graduate study abroad as well as faculty exchange with foreign countries.

For undergraduates, study abroad is most frequently viewed as an opportunity to improve foreign language skills and to expand their horizons by living in another country or culture. The opportunities for studying abroad are increasing. In 1976-77, there were about 650 U.S. college-

sponsored, academic year programs and about 700 summer programs; in 1967-68, there were just over 400 academic year programs and about 230 summer programs. These programs are expensive and are available therefore only to a relatively small proportion of the undergraduate student body. An increasing proportion of those studying abroad at the undergraduate level are studying apparently in countries other than Canada, Mexico and France.

For graduate students the incentives to study abroad are more likely to be academic and professional. Far more clearly structured, but still complex, programs of financing graduate studies abroad are available from federal sources, especially the Fulbright Program as well as foundations, private organizations and foreign governments.

Faculty exchange programs are organized in a similar fashion. Again, the Fulbright Program is the most commonly known. However it is in this area that professional and learned societies such as the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, the International Research and Exchange Board, the National Academy of Sciences through the National Research Council and its Committee on International Relations, to mention only a few, play prominent and effective roles in facilitating the exchange of scientists and scholars.

Hard data to describe the dimensions of these programs are simply not available. It is easier to collate material on persons coming into the United States, because of visa requirements, than it is to gather data on American students studying abroad sponsored by hundreds of different programs and funding sources.

Impressionistic data suggest that about 12,500 students, mostly undergraduates, were studying abroad in 1962. By 1975 it is believed that this figure had risen to 70,000. The Institute of International

Education has reason to believe that the actual number of American students studying abroad may be three to four times these figures.

Hard data are unavailable as well, to describe or analyze the number and characteristics of graduate students studying abroad. Some data are available from the Board of Foreign Scholarships which administers part of the Fulbright Program for the International Communications Agency and the U.S. Office of Education which administers those portions of the Fulbright Program allied with Foreign Languages and Area Studies.

The following tables offer data from the Fulbright-Hayes Program in order to suggest a very modest dimension of the exchange programs available to graduate students, post-doctoral students and established scholars. It has not been possible to determine what proportion of all such exchanges these programs represent. The figures do suggest however that the exchange programs have been substantial over the years. As have all other programs in higher education, exchange programs have suffered from the effects of inflation, some resentment against the rise of federal funds for foreign travel and, in this particular case, the effect of the decline in value of the dollar compared to other currencies.

TABLE 24

FULBRIGHT PROGRAMS SUPPORTING GRADUATE STUDENT GRANTS TO U.S. CITIZENS TO STUDY ABROAD

	ICA Programs		OE Programs[1]	
	1949-76	1975-76	1964-75	1975-76
Number of awards	19,440[2]	323	1,424[3]	146
Total $	----	$2,001,156	---	$1,312,146

1. This program is the Foreign Area and Language Training Program's "Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad."
2. For purposes of comparison to the 1975-76 year, this figure represents an average of 748 awards per year. Thus, the 1975-76 figure is quite low when compared to past years.
3. Similarly, this figure represents an average 129 awards per year. The OE program, then, seems to show some growth.

Source: Board of Foreign Scholarships, Report on Exchanges: December 1976 Fourteenth Annual Report, pp. 17-19.

TABLE 25

FULBRIGHT PROGRAMS SUPPORTING FACULTY GRANTS
TO U.S. CITIZENS TO STUDY ABROAD

	ICA Programs		OE Programs[1]	
	1949-76	1975-76	1964-75	1975-76
Lectures				
Numbers of awards	9,375	380	6,866	974
Total $	----	$5,322,816	----	$1,872,346
Research Scholars				
Numbers of awards	4,596	125	654	30
Total $	----	$1,014,625	---	$ 319,852
Teachers				
Numbers of awards	8,003	205	---	---
Total $	----	$ 839,222	---	---
Total				
Numbers of awards	21,974[2]	710	7,520[3]	1,004
Total $	----	$7,176,663	----	$2,192,198

1. The OE programs referred to, under the Foreign Area Training and Language Program are: for research scholars, "Faculty Research Abroad" and for lecturers, "Group Projects Abroad."
2. This figure represents an average of 846 awards per year, divided between 361 lecturers, 177 research scholars and 308 teachers. Each of these figures exceeds the 1975-76 number.
3. Similarly, this figure represents an average of 684 awards per year, divided between 624 lecturers and 60 research scholars. Again, these are less than the comparable statistics for 1975-76.

Source: Board of Foreign Scholarships, pp. 14-16, 18-19.

TABLE 26

EXCHANGE BY AREA
ACADEMIC GRANTS TO U.S. CITIZENS TO STUDY ABROAD

Area	ICA Programs 1949-76	ICA Programs 1975-76	OE Programs 1964-75	OE Programs 1975-76
Africa	592	52	985	134
Latin America	3,368	86	795	37
East Asia and Pacific	4,099	90	1,339	53
Western Europe	28,520	632	649	7
Eastern Europe	1,704	100	1,544	264
Near East and South Asia	3,131	73	3,582	551
Total	41,414	1,033	8,944	1,046

Source: Board of Foreign Scholarships, pp. 14-19, 38-40.

TABLE 27

EXCHANGE BY AREA
FOREIGN GRANTEES TO THE U.S.

Area	ICA Programs 1949-76	ICA Programs 1975-76	OE Programs[1] 1964-76	OE Programs[1] 1975-76
Africa	2,290	84	35	2
Latin America	10,203	191	60	1
East Asia and Pacific	12,146	207	26	0
Western Europe	42,408	776	35	1
Eastern Europe	2,519	120	10	0
Near East and South Asia	7,843	102	30	3
Total	77,409	1,480	196	7

1. All foreign national grantees in this group (7 in 1975-76, 196 in the 1949-76 period) come to the U.S. under "Curriculum Consultant" awards administered through the Foreign Area and Language Training Program.

Source: Board of Foreign Scholarships, pp. 14-19, 38-40.

III. RECENT EVENTS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

It would be remiss not to bring to the attention of the Commission two items which must be taken into account in their deliberations on this subject. First, outside the legislative branch, the politics of international education as it is engaged in by the higher education associations and parts of the Office of Education is fierce and bloody. Seocndly, a 25-member President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies was recently appointed and will be chaired by James A. Perkins. Executive Director of the Commission is Ms. Barbara B. Burn, on leave from her position as Director of International Programs at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

The politics of international education involve a number of intersecting contentions, issues and actors. Those who are commited to global perspectives are aligned against those whose interests are concentrated on Modern Foreign Languages and Area Studies. In many ways, this is a surrogate for the conflict between the "elite" and "non-elite" institutions. It is not likely that funding supporting one group will be increased unless the other either shares in the increased funds or has funds appropriated for programs appropriate to those institutions. Another area of conflict exists between the members of the executive branch responsible for one or more parts of international education and the higher education associations in this field. The bureaucrats are considered to be arthritic, unimaginative and resistant to changes originating from outside their offices while the associations are accused of naivety and intrusiveness. In addition, the competition for foreign students is creating severe tensions among institutions and the associations which represent them. Such tensions will increase as

decisions must be made to determine which association is to act as the lead agency in negotiating student, especially undergraduate student, exchanges.

Recently the associations were split among themselves, as well as against a number of departments and agencies of the federal government, as a consequence of a study of "International Linkages in Higher Education." Sponsored by six of the seven major higher educational associations and funded by AID, OE, State and two foundations, the preliminary report created intense anger and animosity among those in the associations responsible for programs, services and projects in international education. The wounds have not yet healed.

Representative Paul Simon, urged on by one of his staff, pressured the White House to meet one of the United States' obligations under the Helsinki agreements and appoint a Presidential Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Its recommendations will undoubtedly affect the course of legislation and executive action in these fields.

IV. SOME QUESTIONS AND POLICY ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

I. International Education (General)

International education as presently defined is a mixture of distinct and unrelated activities.

A. Can those elements in which the federal government has a national policy interest be identified and can that interest be articulated?

II. Foreign Language and Area Studies Centers

The funding of NDEA-Title VI Centers and Fellowship Programs has declined in constant dollars over the past decade or more. The contribution of these programs to the national security is unquestioned yet it is difficult to harness support for them. In part the lack of support is a consequence of the difficulty in resolving hard policy questions. Will the market left to itself provide a sufficient number of specialists in languages and area studies?

A. How to develop measures and analyses of the national need for scholars, specialists and Centers?

1. How many centers of what size specializing in which world areas?
2. How to encourage and incorporate greater participation of the humanities and professions?
3. How to maintain the "competences" of those graduates who do not remain in academic pursuits?
4. Can the demand from outside the academy for language and area specialists be encouraged and increased in order to broaden the sources of employment available to graduates and hence maintain the flow of students?

5. How to support scholarly pursuits by those graduates in academic institutions lacking in specialized library and other resources needed to maintain scholarly activities?
6. How to resolve the disciplinary boundary issues?

B. Is the decline of enrollments in commonly taught foreign languages an issue of national concern? Are there an adequate number of students enrolled in and taking advanced degrees in the less commonly taught languages?
   1. How to determine in which of the less commonly taught languages of which world areas enrollments are to be encouraged?
   2. To what extent must colleges and universities depend on language teaching in secondary schools?

C. Are the number of fellowships to be directly related to the number of centers?
   1. To what extent if any, should post-doctoral fellowships be encouraged?
   2. To what extent should federal policy support overseas study by faculty and post-doctoral students?
   3. Should federal policy favor expansion of the existing pool of experts or upgrading those presently in the pool?

D. To what extent can or should manpower planning determine the supply of experts?

III. Advanced Research in International Studies

The contributions of experienced scholars to clarifying and expanding knowledge in international relations, broadly defined, is acknowledged.

Yet support for their research is minimal. A few avenues are open to broaden this support.

A. How best to define the conditions under which universities and foreign governments may effectively be related one to another for the support of faculty and research.

B. Is there a need to establish National Centers for Advanced Research in International Studies?

1. If so, how many are needed and where should they be located?

C. As an alternative can the establishment of additional vehicles such as The National Council for Soviet and East European Research fill the nation's and higher education's needs?

1. In either case, can mechanisms be established which would maximize the participation of graduates of Foreign Language and Area Study Centers presently teaching at institutions lacking the library and other resources needed to maintain high levels of competence?

2. What incentives can be developed to attract scholars and students from the humanities and professions into such centers or research councils?

IV. Student and Faculty Exchange

The international exchange of students and faculty is organized and administered by a complex network of private and public agencies. Public funding has remained relatively constant, although the effect of inflation has acted to reduce the program's scope. Probably the most pressing issue is the determination of the level of funding of graduate and post-doctoral fellowships.

A. Undergraduate

1. Is a national policy needed to encourage students from poor countries to study in the United States?
2. Is a national policy needed to distribute students from one nation broadly among institutions in the United States?
3. To what extent are colleges and universities distorting their capacities to educate foreign students as they compete for these students?
4. Is a federal program of undergraduate scholarship for students from selected countries, the "poorest of the poor," a reasonable and feasible idea?
5. As enrollment in undergraduate education in the U.S. declines will the competition for foreign students increase in order to maintain student-faculty ratios? How will State governments react to these activities?

B. Graduate

1. Since foreign graduate students make up a substantial proportion of all foreign students, will state governments continue to be willing to subsidize their education in high cost graduate programs?
2. Should language training be encouraged by increasing the number of graduate fellowships for study abroad?

C. Faculty Exchange

1. Are the public and private resources available in sufficient amounts to maintain significant efforts in this area?

2. Can immigration and visa requirements be accommodated to avoid embarrassing denials of visas by the State Department to visiting scholars?

D. Employment Arrangements for Foreign Students and Faculty

1. Is a national policy needed which would facilitate academically related employment by foreign undergraduate and graduate students?

2. Is a national policy needed which would facilitate the hiring of foreign faculty, especially on a short term basis?

APPENDIX

Appendix

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS INVOLVED IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACCORDING TO ACE

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
- Institutional Grants Program
- Central Research Contract Program
- Title XII

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
- Agricultural Research Service
  - Foreign Agricultural Research Grants
  - Tropical & Sub-Tropical Research
- Economic Research Service
  - Academic Degree Training
  - International Technical Assistance
  - Foreign Demand and Competition

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
- National Institute of Education
- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
- Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange
  - University Lecturing and Postdoctoral Research Abroad
  - Predoctoral Study and Research Abroad
  - Cultural Presentations Program
  - American Specialists Program
- External Research Program

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
- Transportation Research Activities Overseas
- Urban Mass Transit Administration

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
- Special Foreign Currency Program
- General Opportunities

JAPAN-U.S. FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION
- Japanese Studies
- American Studies
- Arts
- Cultural Communication and Public Affairs

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION
- Research Associateships Program
- Grants and Contracts Research

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
- Advisory Committee on the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe
- Board on International Organizations and Programs
- Board on Science and Technology for International Development
- Board on International Scientific Exchange
- Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China
- Ocean Policy Committee

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
- Institutional Grants
  - Pilot Grants
  - Development Grants
  - Consultant Grants
  - College Library Program
- Higher Education Projects
  - Humanities Institutes Program
  - Curriculum Materials Grants
  - General Projects in Higher Education
- Elementary and Secondary Education Projects
- General Research Program
- Research Materials Program
- State-Based Program
- Media Program
- Museums and Historical Organization Program
- Fellowships for Independent Study and Research
- Fellowships in Residence for College Teachers
- Summer Stipends
- Summer Seminars for College Teachers
- Fellowships and Stipends for the Profession
- Youthgrants
- Challenge Grants

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH: JOHN E. FOGARTY CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES

- Fogarty Scholars-in-Residence
- International Research Fellowships
- Senior International Fellowships
- Swedish and Swiss Fellows Exchange Program
- Gorgas Memorial Laboratory
- World Health Organization Fellowships

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

- International Travel Grants
- U.S.-Australia Cooperative Science Program
- U.S.-Republic of China Cooperative Science Program
- Cooperative Science Programs: Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria
- U.S.-France Cooperative Science Program
- U.S.-India Exchange of Scientists Program
- U.S.-Israel Binational Science Foundation
- U.S.-Italy Cooperative Science Program
- U.S.-Japan Cooperative Science Program
- U.S.-Latin America Cooperative Science Program
- U.S.-New Zealand Agreement for Scientific and Technological Cooperation
- U.S.-U.S.S.R. Cooperative Science Program
- Scientists and Engineers in Economic Development Program
- Special Foreign Currency Program
- NATO Postdoctoral Fellowships
- NATO Travel Grants Program

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

- Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
- Academic Appointments (Higher Education Research and Training Programs)
- International Exchange of Scientific and Literary Publications and Governmental Documents
- Smithsonian Special Foreign Currency Grants

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

- Overseas Speakers Program

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION: DIVISION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
- Foreign Language and Area Centers
- Undergraduate International Studies Program
- Graduate International Studies Program
- Foreign Language and Area Fellowship Program
- Foreign Language and Area Studies Research Program
- Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Program
- Faculty Research Abroad Program
- Foreign Curriculum Consultant Program
- Group Projects Abroad Program
- Ethnic Heritage Studies Program
- Facilitative Service Program
- Teaching Positions and Short-Term Seminars Abroad
- International Educational Development Program

ADDENDUM: SUPPORT OF FOREIGN AREA RESEARCH
- Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
- Department of Defense
- Executive Office of the President
- Federal Energy Administration
- Department of Health, Education and Welfare
- Department of Labor
- Department of the Treasury
- Miscellaneous